

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,449	02/13/2002	Edward T. LeBreton	32285	8968
116	7590 04/19/2006		EXAMINER	
PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 9TH STREET			STAICOVICI, STEFAN	
SUITE 1200		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CLEVELANI	O, OH 44114-3108		1732	
			DATE MAILED: 04/19/2000	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/074,449	LEBRETON ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stefan Staicovici	1732	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DY - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI a. cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 Fe	ebruary 2006.		
· <u> </u>	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		•	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	ix parte Quayle, 1935 C.E	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20,24-32 and 35-43 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20, 24-32 and 35-43 is/are rejected for the claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of the correction of the cor	- · ·	• •	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
<u> </u>			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori</li> </ul>	s have been received. s have been received in A	Application No	
application from the International Bureau	` '''		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not	received.	
attachment(s)			
) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	

Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

6) Other: \_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' amendment filed February 6, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1-20, 24-32 and 35-43 are pending in the instant application.

### Claim Objections

2. Claim 43 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 14, before "around," "map" should be replace with --mat--. Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-20, 24-26 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 1, the newly added limitation of "wherein said intermixed fibers substantially maintain said preform shape" (emphasis added) does not appear to have support in the original disclosure. Although, the original disclosure appears to have support that "wherein said

intermixed fibers substantially maintain a shape of said at least one portion" (emphasis added), the original disclosure does not appear to have support to have support for the broader limitation of "wherein said intermixed fibers substantially maintain said preform shape" (emphasis added). Claims 2-20 and 24-26 are rejected as dependent claims.

In claim 43, the limitation of "wrapping said map around said cylindrical portion" does not appear to have support in the original disclosure. Although, the original disclosure appears to have support for "wrapping said map to form said cylindrical sidewall portion", the original disclosure does not appear to have support to have support for the limitation of "wrapping said map around said cylindrical portion."

- 5. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In claim 35, the limitation of "positioning said preform...without a prior winding step" (emphasis added) is unclear because it appears that the original disclosure describes a step of "providing/forming said preform...without a prior step" (emphasis added) but not, as claimed, "positioning said preform...without a prior winding step." Further clarification is required.
- 6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- Claims 1-20, 24-32 and 35-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as 7. being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the

steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: forming/providing the hollow preform as an "assembled preform." Further clarification is required.

8. Claims 31-32, 35-37 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 31-32 and 35-37 recites the limitation to "maintain the distribution of the thermoplastic material." However, it is unclear to which distribution Applicants are referring because once the thermoplastic fibers melt and pressure is applied by the inner core, the thermoplastic material will distribute itself among the reinforcing fiber. Further clarification is required.

In claim 43, it is unclear whether Applicants are claiming that the preform also includes the mold and the inflatable core. Further clarification is required.

#### Response to Arguments

- 9. Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2006 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 10. It is noted that in order to establish common ownership, under MPEP §706.02(1)(2)(II), "the attorney or agent of record for Application X states, in a clear and conspicuous manner, that: 'Application X and Patent A were, at the time the invention of Application X was made, owned by Company Z." Such a "clear and conspicuous" statement is not present in Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2006. Further clarification is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/074,449

Art Unit: 1732

Conclusion

Page 5

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Stefan Staicovici, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1208. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael P. Colaianni, can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stefan Staicovici, PhD

**Primary Examiner** 

AU 1732

April 17, 2006